

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Preliminarily, regarding the Restriction Requirement, Applicants affirm the election of Group I, claims 1-21.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-21 will be pending of which claim 1 is independent. Claims 22-24 have been cancelled (without prejudice or disclaimer). Some editorial revisions have been made to claim 1 to further indicate that  $X_1$  in component (i) is the same as  $X_1$  in component (ii), and that the "residue of a multifunctional isocyanate" in component (ii) is other than  $X_1$ . Furthermore, claim 19 has been revised to indicate that the product is obtained by a process comprising curing the composition of claim 1. Finally, the Abstract has been expanded. No new matter has been introduced with any of the above amendments.

Regarding paragraph 6 of the outstanding Office Action, Applicants note that the Abstract has been expanded.

Regarding paragraph 7 of the outstanding Office Action, i.e. the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112 and 101, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot as claim 21 has been cancelled.

Regarding paragraph 8 of the outstanding Office Action, i.e. the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, Applicants note that claim 19 has been reviewed and revised bearing in mind the Examiner's concerns.

In paragraph 9 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-21 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. First, with regard to the Examiner's concern that "it is unclear if  $X_1$  is required to be identical for (i) and (ii)", Applicants respectfully note that  $X_1$  in component (ii) refers back to  $X_1$  in component (i) (note the use of *said*  $X_1$ ). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that it is clear that  $X_1$  is the same for component (i) and (ii). Second, regarding the difference between  $X_1$  and the residue of a

multifunctional isocyanate, Applicants note that claim 1, as amended, features that the residue is present *in addition* to  $X_1$ . Third, regarding heteroatoms in  $X_1$ , the Examiner's concerns are not understood as the application clearly sets forth that, e.g., alkoxy groups may be present in  $X_1$ . *See, e.g.*, page 11 of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that all claims are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112.


In paragraph 11 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,837,750 by Szum et al. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that Szum *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a composition comprising the present components (i) and (ii), wherein  $X_1$  in component (i) is the same as  $X_1$  in component (ii).

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed and overcome, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Paul L. Sharer  
Registration No. 36,004  
Direct No. (703) 905-2180

PLS/wdw  
PO Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 905-2000 Telephone  
(703) 905-2500 Facsimile

Date: January 7, 2004  
Attachment: ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE